THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V. ESWARAIAH

WRIT PETITION No.6366 OF 2006

DATED: 29-03-2006

BETWEEN

P. Amar Singh,

S/o. P. Bhagirath Singh,

Occ: Hotel Business,

Shop Nos.1, 7 and part of 11,

Rukmini Apartments,

Premises Bearing No.8-3-228/R/5,

Yousufguda Check Post,

Rahmathnagar, Hyderabad

And others.

...PETITIONERS

AND

Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad,

Rep. by its Commissioner, Lower

Tank Bund, Hyderabad.

…RESPONDENT

ORDER:

Petitioners seek a Writ of Mandamus to declare the impugned Notice in Letter No. 76/TPS/C5/MCH/2006 dated 17.03.2006 issued by the respondent as illegal and arbitrary.

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as the learned standing counsel appearing for the respondent.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are the bonafide purchasers of the small shops consisting of Shop
Nos. 1 to 17 admeasuring 5 Sq. yards in Rukmini Apartment building bearing No.8-3-222 forming part of Sy.No.115, 116 and 119 situated at Yousufguda, Hyderabad under various registered sale deeds. He further submits that originally the said premises was constructed and developed by M/s. Rukmini Bai and others and M/s. Engineers Syndicate by duly obtaining permission from the respondent for construction and the petitioners are the subsequent purchasers of the said shops. Subsequently the petitioners obtained licence from the competent authority and doing their business and paying property tax to the respondent.

While so, the respondent without issuing any show cause notice, issued a notice in Letter No. 76/TPS/C5/MCH/2006 dated
17.03.2006 under Section 636 of Hyderabad Municipal Corporation Act, 1955, stating that the petitioners have made constructions not covered by the sanctioned plan and converted parking space in cellar floor other than parking and carried out the said construction which is unauthorized and causing lot of inconvenience to the inmates in the building and also to the visitors of the building, resulting in vehicles being parked on the road, creating lot of traffic congestion, accident and public nuisance and also that the High Court in suo-motto contempt case in C.C.No.101 of 1996, dated 28-02-1996 ordered that steps be taken immediately for creation for parking areas with a view to reduce traffic congestion being created on account of cars being parked on roads for want of parking within the premises. Accordingly, the petitioners were directed to remove the said unauthorized structures within three days.

I am of the opinion that issuing notice under Section 636 of the Hyderabad Municipal Corporation Act, 1955 is in respect of the buildings, which have been constructed after obtaining permission for construction of the cellar, ground floor and upper floors, the relevant provision to issue a notice is under Section 452 of the Act. If that is the case, it is for the respondents to point out whether the petitioners have converted the parking place into shops. If there is any deviation or conversion, it is for the respondents to issue a show cause notice under Section 452 of the Act. But, without issuing any show cause notice, straight away a notice under Section 636 of the Act, as if the constructions have been made

without any permission, has been issued directing the petitioners to remove the structures.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the impugned notice dated 17-03-2006 in Letter No. 76/TPS/C5/MCH/2006 is directed to be treated as a show cause notice only permitting the petitioners to file an explanation/representation within one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and on such an explanation being filed and till such representation/explanation is considered and appropriate orders are passed and communicated to the petitioners, the respondents shall not remove or demolish the premises of the petitioners.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

_____

V. ESWARAIAH, J

March 29, 2006

DSK